TABLE II. 27

CROSSTABULATION OF DISTANCE TRAVELED
BY SITE: BOSTON AND SEATTLE RECREATION SURVEY

	Boston one	Boston two	Boston three	Boston four	Boston five	Boston six	Seattle one	Seattle two	Seattle three	Row Total
Distance in Miles										
0 to 2	69	9	60	9	5	3	11	76	1	243
2 to 4	31	40	58	17	1	5	11	46	2	211
4 to 6	21	82	60	16	2	10	5	14	4	214
6 to 8	2	48	46	16	11	13	5	19	8	168
8 to 10	0	28	18	32	7	18	2	17	5	127
10 to 15	2	28	22	51	1	30	3	10	13	160
15 to 20	0	3	2	45	0	45	2	4	16	117
20 to 30	0	1	5	45	3	24	0	0	1	79
30 to 50	0	0	2	56	6	23	0	0	0	87
50 to 75	0	0	0	30	64	1	0	1	0	96
over 75	0	0	2	23	142	2	1	9	0	179
Column Total	125	239	275	340	242	174	40	196	50	1681

TABLE II. 28

CROSSTABULATION OF INCOME BY SITE:
BOSTON AND SEATTLE RECREATION SURVEY

	Boston two	Boston three	Boston four	Boston five	Boston six	Seattle one	Seattle two	Seattle three	Row Total
Income									
0 to 5000	36	42	26	16	13	13	43	2	185
5000 to 7500	22	23	28	11	7	3	16	3	113
7500 to 10000	56	40	48	29	28	6	33	7	247
10000 to 12500	36	50	46	26	31	3	34	7	233
12500 to 15000	31	37	48	34	31	6	16	8	211
15000 to 20000	14	26	44	30	30	5	17	14	180
20000 to 25000	9	12	26	25	7	1	12	4	96
over 25000	3	11	16	36	4	1	17	1	89
Column Total	201	241	282	207	151	38	188	46	1354

TABLE II. 29

CROSSTABULATION OF EDUCATION BY SITE:

BOSTON AND SEATTLE RECREATION SURVEY

	Boston two	Boston three	Boston four	Boston five	Boston six	Seattle one	Seattle two	Seattle three	Row Total
Education									
K to 8	6	6	2	1	3	0	3	0	21
Some High School	19	11	6	3	12	1	4	2	58
High School Grad	134	134	100	55	67	9	40	19	558
Some College	15	34	40	30	23	5	14	5	166
Other Post Secondary	6	20	26	15	9	0	5	1	82
College Grad	19	31	78	76	31	4	39	6	284
Higher Degree	8	13	24	37	8	0	10	2	102
High School Student	3	4	15	6	4	10	23	2	77
College Student	14	13	38	14	5	11	41	7	143
Higher Degree Student	6	2	10	4	3	0	6	2	33
Column Total	230	268	339	241	165	40	195	46	1524

Interestingly enough, however, not only is distance associated with site quality, but equally strongly, so is income--see Table 11.28. This means, of course, that the higher travel distances observed to the "higher quality" sites are not simply a reflection of similar randomly selected populations traveling longer distances. Clearly Boston two and Boston three are low income sites, Boston four and five, high income, and Boston six middle income in composition.

The same finding appears in Table 11.29, which presents the cross-tabulations of education with site. Given the association of income with education in the society, one would expect to find the associations we do. None the less, the strength of the pattern is a bit surprising. At Cape Cod and the high quality suburban beaches, of the 493 non-students, 215 or about 44% had college or higher degrees. Of the 456 non-students at the in-city beaches and the lower quality fresh water lakes, 71 or 16% had college or higher degrees. To sharpen this contrast, at Boston two 159 of 207 adults had high school degrees or less (77%) while at Boston, five 59 or 217 were in that education category (27%).

The contrast with Seattle is most interesting. The Lake Washington beaches are not of high quality by eastern "sand and surf" standards and do not attract people from great distances. However, of the adults interviewed 34% had college or higher degrees--much closer to Cape Cod than in-town patterns as exhibited in the Boston area.

The preceding analyses show that upper income and upper education people use better sites and that better sites on average attract

people longer distances. It does not necessarily follow, however, that income and education will be related to distance travelled. Indeed in so far as better sites are in suburban neighborhoods and upper income and education people live in such areas, they would appear to have locational advantages which would make possible the use of higher quality sites at lower transport distances. Indeed one might even argue that differential accessibility helps to account for differentialed use.

To help resolve this problem we present crosstabulations, for Boston and Seattle separately, on the relationship of income and education to distance travelled (Tables II.30 through II.33). It turns out in fact that despite potential accessibility advantages, upper income and education respondents in fact have travelled further--although this is much more evident in the Boston than in the Seattle data. For example 113 of 218 Boston respondents with incomes under $7500 per year (52%) travelled less than 8 miles. In contrast 39 of the 149 persons surveyed with incomes over $20,000 a year (26%) travelled such distances (Table II.30).

Similarly, 50% of those with high school degress or less travelled less than 8 miles, while only 26% of those with college or higher degrees interviewed in the Boston area had travelled less than 8 miles (Table II.32). At the same time, 117 of 325 at the latter education level (36%) had travelled more than 50 miles, while only 71 of 559 in the lower education bracket (13%) had travelled these longer distances.

TABLE II. 30

CROSSTABULATION OF INCOME

BY DISTANCE TRAVELED: BOSTON RECREATION SURVEY

DISTANCE IN MILES	0-2	2-4	4-6	6-8	8-10	10-15	15-20	20-30	30-40	40-50	50-75	75-100	OVER 100	ROW TOTAL
Income														
0 to 5000	13	13	25	18	5	14	8	4	6	2	10	2	7	127
5000 to 7500	7	13	14	10	6	11	7	6	4	4	8	0	1	91
7500 to 10000	13	20	20	23	19	26	14	9	8	2	14	13	9	200
10000 to 12500	15	18	29	20	22	16	21	11	9	1	10	2	15	189
12500 to 15000	13	8	27	23	18	18	12	12	9	7	10	3	20	181
15000 to 20000	9	7	13	15	8	19	14	14	13	2	8	5	17	144
20000 to 25000	5	7	5	6	9	7	5	5	5	0	5	2	18	79
Over 25000	4	2	6	4	0	6	3	5	3	0	10	7	20	70
Column Total	79	88	149	119	87	117	84	66	57	18	75	34	107	1080

TABLE II. 31

CROSSTABULATION OF INCOME

BY DISTANCE TRAVELED: SEATTLE RECREATION SURVEY

DISTANCE IN MILES	0-2	2-4	4-6	6-8	8-10	10-15	15-20	20-30	50-75	75-100	OVER 100	ROW TOTAL
Income												
0 to 5000	20	15	9	4	7	1	0	1	0	0	1	58
5000 to 7500	8	5	2	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	1	22
7500 to 10000	18	7	3	5	5	4	1	0	1	0	2	46
10000 to 12500	9	16	3	7	3	2	3	0	0	1	0	44
12500 to 15000	6	7	3	7	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	30
15000 to 20000	7	4	1	4	5	9	6	0	0	0	0	36
20000 to 25000	7	2	0	2	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	17
Over 25000	9	1	0	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	2	19
Column Total	84	57	21	30	24	26	21	1	1	1	6	272

TABLE II. 32

CROSSTABULATION OF EDUCATION

BY DISTANCE TRAVELED: BOSTON RECREATION SURVEY

DISTANCE IN MILES	0-2	2-4	4-6	6-8	8-10	10-15	15-20	20-30	30-40	40-50	50-75	75-100	OVER 100	ROW TOTAL
Education														
K to 8	0	5	1	3	1	2	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	18
Some High School	7	6	10	8	4	5	4	2	0	0	2	1	1	51
High School Graduate	38	56	91	57	42	52	35	24	25	5	25	16	24	490
Some College	8	7	21	18	9	11	16	12	8	3	13	2	13	141
Other Post Secondary	3	6	14	11	3	7	4	7	5	5	5	2	4	76
College Graduate	14	16	13	19	18	24	12	22	9	5	24	13	46	235
Higher Degree	3	4	7	8	5	10	5	4	8	2	9	5	20	90
High School Student	5	2	1	1	6	4	3	1	2	0	5	1	1	32
College Student	6	11	5	5	10	11	9	1	6	1	5	3	11	84
Higher Degree Student	0	2	4	0	0	5	3	3	1	0	6	0	1	25
Column Total	86	116	167	131	98	131	93	76	65	22	95	43	122	1246

TABLE II. 33

CROSSTABULATION OF EDUCATION

BY DISTANCE TRAVELED: SEATTLE RECREATION SURVEY

DISTANCE IN MILES	0-2	2-4	4-6	6-8	8-10	10-15	15-20	20-30	50-75	75-100	OVER 100	ROW TOTAL
Education												
K to 8	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Some High School	3	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	7
High School Graduate	19	9	6	8	7	6	9	1	1	1	1	68
Some College	6	7	3	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	1	24
Other Post Secondary	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	6
College Graduate	16	10	4	6	4	4	1	0	0	0	4	49
Higher Degree	4	5	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	12
High School Student	13	11	5	4	5	5	1	0	0	0	1	45
College Student	21	13	2	9	4	7	3	0	0	0	0	59
Higher Degree Student	2	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	8
Column Total	86	59	23	32	23	26	20	1	1	1	9	281

To disentangle these results still further, we prepared separate crosstabulations of income and education versus distance travelled for five sets of sites where we had enough appropriate data, Boston two through Boston six. For income, these are Tables II.34 - II.38 and for education, Tables II.39 - II.43. The most interesting finding from these tables is how few differences there are among income or education groups with respect to distance travelled, once site has been taken into account. This implies a major finding of the study. It is differences in preferences for sites of different kinds which accounts for the differences in distance travelled among these various categories of surveyed recreation users.

One does find for site categories Boston four and Boston five that the upper half of the income classes do account for a disproportionate share of those who travelled over 100 miles. In Boston four, with college and higher degrees having a slightly larger share of those who travelled less than 8 miles and more than 100 miles, compared to those who had a high school degree or less. We also find college and higher degree holders disproportionately among those who travelled more than 100 miles to Boston five (Cape Cod).

In summary, when one randomly samples recreation users, one finds more upper income and education people at higher quality sites than at lower quality sites. On average such individuals had travelled further than lower income/education individuals. They had not travelled more than those lower on the socio/economic scale at the same site, but rather they had chosen different kinds of sites.

TABLE II. 34

CROSSTABULATION OF INCOME

BY DISTANCE TRAVELED: BOSTON RECREATION SURVEY
(Boston, Site Two)

Distance in Miles	0-2	2-4	4-6	6-8	8-10	10-15	15-20	20-30	Row Total
Income									
0 to 5000	1	3	12	8	1	4	1	0	30
5000 to 75000	2	4	9	5	2	0	0	0	22
7500 to 10000	1	8	14	12	8	13	0	0	56
10000 to 12500	2	4	13	6	7	4	0	0	36
12500 to 15000	0	4	12	8	5	2	0	0	31
15000 to 20000	0	4	4	3	1	2	0	0	14
20000 to 25000	2	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	9
Over 25000	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Column Total	8	28	67	43	25	27	2	1	201

TABLE II. 35

CROSSTABULATION OF INCOME

BY DISTANCE TRAVELED: BOSTON RECREATION SURVEY
(Boston, Site Three)

Distance in Miles	0-2	2-4	4-6	6-8	8-10	10-15	15-20	20-30	30-40	Over 100	Row Total
Income											
0 to 5000	10	9	9	10	1	2	0	0	1	0	42
5000 to 7500	4	9	3	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	23
7500 to 10000	10	8	10	5	4	1	0	0	1	1	40
10000 to 12500	12	9	11	8	2	5	1	2	0	0	50
12500 to 15000	9	3	12	6	3	4	0	0	0	0	37
15000 to 20000	6	3	4	6	2	3	1	1	0	0	26
20000 to 25000	1	2	3	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	12
Over 25000	3	1	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	11
Column Total	55	44	55	42	17	20	2	3	2	1	241

TABLE II. 36

CROSSTABULATION OF INCOME

BY DISTANCE TRAVELED: BOSTON RECREATION SURVEY
(Boston, Site Four)

Distance in Miles	0-2	2-4	4-6	6-8	8-10	10-15	15-20	20-30	30-40	40-50	50-75	75-100	Over 100	Row Total
Income														
0 to 5000	1	0	4	0	2	5	3	2	4	1	3	1	0	26
5000 to 7500	1	0	1	3	1	6	7	2	4	2	1	0	0	28
7500 to 10000	0	4	5	3	5	6	2	9	3	2	7	1	1	48
10000 to 12500	1	4	3	2	5	5	10	5	7	1	2	0	1	46
12500 to 15000	2	0	0	4	7	6	6	5	5	3	5	0	4	47
15000 to 20000	2	0	3	2	3	11	3	7	8	0	3	0	2	44
20000 to 25000	2	4	0	1	2	3	3	3	3	0	2	0	3	26
Over 25000	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	2	0	1	0	2	16
Column Total	9	12	16	15	25	45	37	38	36	9	24	2	13	281

TABLE II. 37

CROSSTABULATION OF INCOME

BY DISTANCE TRAVELED: BOSTON RECREATION SURVEY
(Boston, Site Five)

Distance in Miles	0-2	2-4	4-6	6-8	8-10	10-15	20-30	40-50	50-75	75-100	Over 100	Row Total
Income												
0 to 5000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	7	16
5000 to 7500	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	7	0	1	11
7500 to 10000	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	7	12	7	29
10000 to 12500	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	8	2	14	26
12500 to 15000	1	1	0	2	0	1	2	3	5	3	16	34
15000 to 20000	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	5	5	15	30
20000 to 25000	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	3	2	15	25
Over 25000	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	7	18	36
Column Total	4	1	2	9	7	1	2	6	50	32	93	207

TABLE II. 38

CROSSTABULATION OF INCOME

BY DISTANCE TRAVELED: BOSTON RECREATION SURVEY
(Boston, Site Six)

Distance in Miles	0-2	2-4	4-6	6-8	8-10	10-15	15-20	20-30	30-40	40-50	50-75	Row Total
Income												
0 to 5000	1	1	0	0	1	3	4	2	1	0	0	13
5000 to 7500	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	7
7500 to 10000	1	0	1	2	1	6	12	0	4	0	0	27
10000 to 12500	0	1	2	3	7	2	10	4	2	0	0	31
12500 to 15000	1	0	3	3	3	5	6	5	4	1	0	31
15000 to 20000	0	0	1	2	1	3	10	6	5	2	0	30
20000 to 25000	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	7
Over 25000	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4
Column Total	3	3	9	10	13	24	43	22	19	3	1	150

TABLE II. 39

CROSSTABULATION OF EDUCATION

BY DISTANCE TRAVELED: BOSTON RECREATION SURVEY
(Boston, Site Two)

Distance in Miles	0-2	2-4	4-6	6-8	8-10	10-15	15-20	20-30	Row Total
Education									
K to 8	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	6
Some High School	1	3	8	5	1	1	0	0	19
High School Grad	4	22	50	24	18	15	0	1	134
Some College	0	1	6	5	1	2	0	0	15
Other Post Secondary	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	6
College Grad	2	2	3	5	2	3	2	0	19
Higher Degree	0	1	3	0	1	3	0	0	8
High School Student	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
College Student	2	3	3	2	2	1	1	0	14
Higher Degree Student	0	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	6
Column Total	9	37	79	47	26	28	3	1	230

TABLE II. 40

CROSS TABULATION OF EDUCATION

BY DISTANCE TRAVELED: BOSTON RECREATION SURVEY
(Boston, Site Three)

Distance in Miles	0-2	2-4	4-6	6-8	8-10	10-15	15-20	20-30	30-40	Over 100	Row Total
Education											
K to 8	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	6
Some High School	6	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
High School Grad	33	28	32	24	5	8	2	1	1	0	134
Some College	6	4	12	3	3	4	0	2	0	0	34
Other Post Secondary	1	3	8	3	1	3	0	1	0	0	20
College Grad	6	4	4	5	5	5	0	1	0	1	31
Higher Degree	1	2	2	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	13
High School Student	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
College Student	2	7	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	13
Higher Degree Student	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Column Total	58	55	60	44	18	22	2	5	2	2	268

TABLE II. 41

CROSSTABULATION OF EDUCATION

BY DISTANCE TRAVELED: BOSTON RECREATION SURVEY
(Boston, Site Four)

Distance in Miles	0-2	2-4	4-6	6-8	8-10	10-15	15-20	20-30	30-40	40-50	50-75	75-100	Over 100	Row Total
Education														
K to 8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Some High School	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	5
High School Grad	1	4	4	2	12	15	16	14	14	3	10	3	2	100
Some College	0	2	3	5	2	2	6	5	7	3	4	0	1	40
Other Post Secondary	1	3	2	2	0	3	3	5	3	3	1	0	0	26
College Grad	4	6	5	4	6	11	5	15	5	2	8	0	7	78
Higher Degree	0	1	1	0	1	6	4	2	5	0	1	0	3	24
High School Student	2	0	0	0	5	3	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	15
College Student	1	1	0	2	6	7	8	0	6	1	2	2	2	38
Higher Degree Student	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	1	0	2	0	0	10
Column Total	9	17	16	16	32	51	45	45	43	13	30	5	16	338

TABLE II. 42

CROSSTABULATION OF EDUCATION

BY DISTANCE TRAVELED: BOSTON RECREATION SURVEY

(Boston, Site Five)

Distance in Miles	0-2	2-4	4-6	6-8	8-10	10-15	20-30	40-50	50-75	75-100	Over 100	Row Total
Education												
K to 8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Some High School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
High School Grad	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	2	15	12	22	55
Some College	2	0	0	3	2	0	1	0	8	2	12	30
Other Post Secondary	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	4	2	4	15
College Grad	1	1	0	2	3	0	1	1	16	13	38	76
Higher Degree	2	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	8	5	17	37
High School Student	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	6
College Student	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	9	14
Higher Degree Student	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
Column Total	5	1	2	11	7	1	3	6	64	37	104	241

TABLE II. 43

CROSSTABULATION OF EDUCATION

BY DISTANCE TRAVELED: BOSTON RECREATION SURVEY
(Boston, Site Six)

Distance in Miles	0-2	2-4	4-6	6-8	8-10	10-15	15-20	20-30	30-40	40-50	50-75	75-100	Row Total
Education													
K to 8	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Some High School	0	0	1	1	3	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	12
High School Grad	0	2	4	5	6	14	17	8	10	0	0	1	67
Some College	0	0	0	2	1	3	10	4	1	0	1	0	22
Other Post Secondary	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	9
College Grad	1	3	1	3	2	5	5	5	4	2	0	0	31
Higher Degree	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	1	0	0	8
High School Student	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
College Student	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Higher Degree Student	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Column Total	3	5	10	12	15	29	43	22	20	3	1	1	164

II.4.2. Frequency of Use

When we look at frequency of use by site for this year (Table II.44) and last year (Table II.45) we find some interesting results. About 53% of the users of Boston five and Boston six sites (the state parks and Cape Cod) didn't use them last year while only 1/4 of the picnickers at Boston one sites had not used the area the previous year. Similarly, one-third were newcomers at Boston three. Also, at Boston one and three over 1/2 those surveyed said they had used the area five or more times last year. Only 24% of Boston five and six users had made such heavey use of their sites the previous year. The data for this year's use show the same pattern. Boston sites one and three had gotten the most habitual users--just as both Seattle one and Seattle two did (and had last year). These are all relatively low quality areas. In contrast, the higher quality sites, Seattle site three, and in Boston sites five and six, had the least very frequent use this year. Boston sites two and four are in an intermediate position. Notice that the "good beaches" of Boston four attract higher income and education patrons from longer distances than the lower quality sites of Boston two. Yet both types of sites apparently have very similar use frequencies.

The relationship between distance travelled and use frequency this year and last year in Boston is very clear (See Tables II.46, II.47). The pattern is similar, if less striking in Seattle in part because of the smaller sample (Table II.48, II.49). The point is simply that longer travel distances lead to somewhat less frequent

TABLE II. 44

CROSSTABULATION OF THIS YEAR'S USE OF SITE BY SITE CLASS:
BOSTON AND SEATTLE RECREATION SURVEY

No. of Times	Boston One	Boston Two	Boston Three	Boston Four	Boston Five	Boston Six	Seattle One	Seattle Two	Seattle Three	Row Total
1	35	83	38	108	126	91	9	47	21	558
2 - 4	35	73	69	106	73	44	11	43	10	464
5 or More	56	82	167	126	43	38	20	106	19	657
Column Total	126	238	274	340	242	173	40	196	50	1679

TABLE II. 45

CROSSTABULATION OF LAST YEAR'S USE OF SITE BY SITE CLASS:
BOSTON AND SEATTLE RECREATION SURVEY

	Boston One	Boston Two	Boston Three	Boston Four	Boston Five	Boston Six	Seattle One	Seattle Two	Seattle Three	Total
No. of times										
0	32	92	88	123	128	93	13	80	23	672
1	4	33	10	23	24	12	2	6	9	123
2 - 4	25	36	36	62	38	23	7	17	5	249
5 or More	64	77	140	132	52	47	18	93	13	636
Column Total	125	238	274	340	242	175	40	196	50	1680

TABLE II. 46

CROSSTABULATION OF THIS YEAR'S USE OF SITE BY DISTANCE TRAVELED

BOSTON RECREATION SURVEY

Distance in miles	0-2	2-4	4-6	6-8	8-10	10-15	15-20	20-30	30-40	40-50	50-75	75-100	Over 100	Row Total
Number of times														
Once	28	31	57	37	32	42	32	32	23	12	46	24	84	480
2 to 4	34	43	50	39	31	40	26	27	31	4	33	13	28	399
5 or more	93	77	84	59	40	52	35	19	11	6	16	7	12	512
Column Total	155	151	191	135	103	134	93	78	65	22	95	44	124	1391

TABLE II. 47

CROSSTABULATION OF LAST YEAR'S USE OF SITE BY DISTANCE TRAVELED:

BOSTON RECREATION SURVEY

Distance in miles	0-2	2-4	4-6	6-8	8-10	10-15	15-20	20-30	30-40	40-50	50-75	75-100	Over 100	Row Total
Number of Times														
zero	35	46	81	34	35	56	45	36	26	10	53	13	83	554
once	5	10	19	16	7	5	7	6	1	1	8	9	12	106
2 to 4	26	19	24	29	16	28	15	11	14	2	13	8	15	220
5 or more	89	76	66	56	45	44	28	25	24	9	21	14	14	512
Column Total	155	152	191	136	103	134	95	78	65	22	95	44	124	1395

TABLE II. 48

CROSSTABULATION OF THIS YEAR'S USE OF SITE BY DISTANCE TRAVELLED:
SEATTLE RECREATION SURVEY

Distance in Miles	0 - 2	2 - 4	4 - 6	6 - 8	8 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 30	50 - 75	75 - 100	Over 100	Row Total
No. of Times												
1	11	10	4	15	5	11	12	1	1	1	6	77
2 - 4	17	17	9	2	5	5	8	0	0	0	1	64
5 or More	60	32	10	16	14	10	2	0	0	0	2	145
Column Total	88	59	23	32	24	26	22	1	1	1	9	286

TABLE II. 49

CROSSTABULATION OF LAST YEAR'S USE OF SITE BY DISTANCE TRAVELLED:
SEATTLE RECREATION SURVEY

Distance in Miles	0 - 2	2 - 4	4 - 6	6 - 8	8 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 30	50 - 75	75 - 100	Over 100	Row Total
No. of Times												
0	32	18	8	9	10	15	13	1	1	0	9	116
1	2	3	0	4	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	17
2 - 4	5	8	2	4	4	3	2	0	0	1	0	29
5 or More	49	30	13	15	10	3	4	0	0	0	0	124
Column Total	88	59	23	32	24	26	22	1	1	1	9	286

use. However, there is great variety in behavior and these patterns are only small tendencies. Note that 30% of the people who travelled between 20 and 100 miles in Boston had used the site they were currently using five or more times the previous year. In contrast, when we consider those who had travelled less than 6 miles, the percentage of users who had made such frequent use of their site last year only rises to 40%.

When we look at income by site use this year and last in Boston and Seattle (Tables II.50 through II.53) the evidence is a bit difficult to interpret. It would appear that in Boston, residents under $7500 a year were somewhat more likely to be habitual users of the facility at which they were found. On the other hand, they did not report such heavy use the previous year. Perhaps geographic mobility is partially responsible for these differences. In both Boston and Seattle one notices another major finding: the distribution of last year's use frequencies tends to be bi-modal. People either didn't come at all or came quite a lot.

Given that distance is negatively associated with repeated use, and that upper income recreation users tend to travel longer distances, one might have expected to find a stronger relationship between income and use frequency than appears. This supports the view that while both lower and upper income users will use a site less frequently because of distance, the latter are not as influenced by any given distance as the former.

TABLE II. 50

CROSSTABULATION OF THIS YEAR'S USE OF SITE BY INCOME:

BOSTON RECREATION SURVEY

Income	0-5000	5000-7500	7500-10000	10000-12500	12500-15000	15000-20000	20000-25000	over 25000	Row Total
No. of Times									
once	36	26	73	56	79	50	28	25	373
2 to 4	39	25	63	54	35	47	25	19	307
5 or more	52	40	65	79	65	45	26	26	398
Column Total	127	91	201	189	179	142	79	70	1082

TABLE II. 51

CROSSTABULATION OF LAST YEAR'S USE OF SITE BY INCOME:

BOSTON RECREATION SURVEY

Income	0-5000	5000-7500	7500-10000	10000-12500	12500-15000	15000-20000	20000-25000	over 25000	Row Total
No. of Times									
zero	52	31	90	77	75	50	34	30	439
once	6	8	12	9	11	21	7	8	82
2 to 4	26	19	34	29	27	24	8	6	173
5 or more	43	33	65	74	67	48	30	26	386
Column Total	127	91	201	189	181	144	79	70	1082

TABLE II. 52

CROSSTABULATION OF THIS YEAR'S USE OF SITE BY INCOME:
SEATTLE RECREATION SURVEY

Amount in Dollars	0 - 5,000	5,000 - 7,500	7,500 - 10,000	10,000 - 12,500	12,500 - 15,000	15,000 - 20,000	20,000 - 25,000	Over 25,000	Row Total
No. of Times									
1	13	1	10	13	9	12	6	6	70
2 - 4	13	1	11	12	4	10	4	4	61
5 or More	32	20	25	19	17	14	7	7	141
Column Total	58	22	46	44	30	36	17	19	272

TABLE II. 53

CROSSTABULATION OF LAST YEAR'S USE OF SITE BY INCOME:
SEATTLE RECREATION SURVEY

Amount in Dollars	0 - 5,000	5,000 - 7,500	7,500 - 10,000	10,000 - 12,500	12,500 - 15,000	15,000 - 25,000	20,000 - 25,000	Over 25,000	Row Total
No. of Times									
0	23	5	18	20	7	16	8	11	108
1	2	0	2	2	6	2	1	0	15
2 - 4	2	3	5	5	5	8	0	1	29
5 or More	31	14	21	17	12	10	8	7	120
Column Total	58	22	46	44	30	36	17	19	272

II.4.3. Reasons For Site Choice

When one looks at the reasons for site choice, crosstabulated by site, (Table II.54) the apparent rationality of the surveyed population is quite reassuring. At the lower quality, in-city beaches of Boston two, 67 percent mention convience and only 4 percent mention the quality of the water or the area. At Cape Cod (Boston five) 15 percent mention convience and 24 percent mention the quality of the area. Notice also the slightly higher values for social/family reasons at Boston five and Boston six (the kids like it, friendly, friends suggested it, family always come here, etc.). I suspect that in part these reasons were produced to justify the choice of the particular site, rather than to explain the choice of the type or class of site selected.

When we asked people what would make them come more often, the responses were also quite illuminating (Table II.55). In general the percentage of people who wanted a cleaner site varied inversely with the quality of the site, except for Boston two. There the first answer produced was most frequently a plea for a bigger beach. (Both the sites in Boston two were crowed with people elbow to elbow on the days of the survey). About 10 percent at Cape Cod and the Lake Washington beaches in Seattle wanted more parking, but in both cases a slightly larger fraction asked for fewer people. It is interesting that at Boston two where crowding was severe enough to provoke a desire for more beach, few suggested the obvious alternative of fewer people while this response occurred more frequently at the much larger and less crowded Cape Cod sites.

Table II.54

CROSSTABULATION OF SITE WITH REASONS FOR SITE CHOICE

BOSTON AND SEATTLE RECREATION SURVEY

	Boston Two	Boston Three	Boston Four	Boston Five	Boston Six	Seattle One	Seattle Two	Seattle Three	ROW TOTAL
Reasons									
Clean Water	13	7	29	14	8	1	3	2	77
Clean Beach	44	2	22	18	1	0	7	0	54
Facilities/Area	4	2	27	24	27	1	30	14	129
Water Characteristics	3	17	8	17	9	0	14	2	70
Uncrowded	2	3	6	13	6	7	9	5	51
Convenient	87	178	180	35	67	18	99	9	673
Social/Family	15	29	17	38	23	3	16	3	144
Habit or Memory	3	3	5	9	5	0	0	0	25
Other	0	2	13	14	3	0	3	1	37
Column Total	148	266	329	233	169	32	188	38	1403
% Convenient	59%	67%	54%	15%	40%	56%	53%	24%	48%
% Clean Water/Clean Beach/Area/Facilities	14%	4%	24%	24%	21%	6%	21%	42%	18%
% Social/Family	10%	11%	5%	16%	14%	9%	8%	8%	10%

Table II.55

CROSSTABULATION OF SITE WITH PREFERENCES FOR SITE IMPROVEMENT
BOSTON AND SEATTLE RECREATION SURVEY

	Boston Two	Boston Three	Boston Four	Boston Five	Boston Six	Seattle One	Seattle Two	Seattle Three	ROW TOTAL
Cleaner Water	15	94	36	12	19	2	8	9	190
Cleaner Beach/ Litter	15	70	23	6	2	6	12	0	134
Cleaner Beach/ Rocks	1	16	50	51	6	1	2	0	127
Warmer Water	0	0	17	8	0	0	0	1	26
More Facilities	19	29	28	23	41	4	36	8	188
Fewer Facilities	0	4	1	5	4	0	1	0	15
Fewer People	8	1	13	21	7	0	13	2	65
More Parking	5	3	10	20	1	0	11	1	51
No Dogs	1	6	3	1	1	1	8	2	23
No Changes/ Don't Know	26	25	84	56	40	2	19	11	263
Bigger Beach	38	0	2	2	10	2	14	4	72
Cleaner Facilities	0	0	4	0	17	0	3	0	24
OTHER	3	4	27	22	2	2	16	1	77
Column Total	131	252	299	227	150	20	143	34	1256
% Cleaner Water/ Beach	24%	71%	36%	30%	18%	45%	15%	26%	
% Don't Know/	20%	10%	28%	25%	27%	10%	13%	32%	